## REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, and 10 are pending in the application. In the non-final Office Action dated July 30, 2007, the Examiner made the following disposition:

A.)    Objected to the specification.

B.)    Rejected claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

C.)    Rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Devine, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0095399)("Devine")* in view of *Kendal, et al. (U.S. 2003/0115291)("Kendall")*.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and addresses the Examiner's disposition below. Claims 1, 5, 7, 9, and 10 have been amended. Claims 2 and 6 have been canceled.

A.)    <u>Objection to the specification:</u>

Claims 5 and 7 have been amended as per the Examiner's request to overcome the objection. Claim 6 has been canceled.

Applicant respectfully submits the objection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

B.)    <u>Rejection of claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §101:</u>

Claims 5 and 7 have been amended as per the Examiner's request to overcome the objection. Claim 6 has been canceled.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

C.)    <u>Rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Devine, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0095399)("Devine")* in view of *Kendal, et al. (U.S. 2003/0115291)("Kendall")*:</u>

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Independent claims 1, 5, 9, and 10 each have been amended to clarify that the processing engines are in-memory processing engines. Further, claims 1, 5, 9, and 10 have been amended to clarify that a solution to a problem is determined by:

- a first processing engine subscribing to and receiving a first datatype, performing a first processing on a data associated with the first datatype, and publishing a first processing result as a second datatype, and

- a second processing engine subscribing to and receiving the second datatype, performing a second processing on the processed data associated with the second datatype to determine the solution to the problem, and publishing the solution as a third datatype.

One of the first and second processing engines is modified during the determining step, wherein the determining of the solution is not interrupted by the modification.

Thus, Applicant's claimed invention uses horizontally-scaled in-memory processing engines to solve problems. A first processing engine processes data to yield a first processing result, and then a second processing engine arrives at a solution to the problem using the first processing result from the first processing engine. Further, a processing engine may be modified without interrupting the determination of a solution.

This is clearly unlike *Devine* in view of *Kendall*, which fails to disclose or suggest modifying a first or second processing engines during a determining step without interrupting the determination of the solution by the modification. The Examiner argues that *Devine* [0058] teaches this claimed subject matter. Applicant disagrees. *Devine* [0058] merely describes that *Devine* performs software upgrade and maintenance via a distributed administrator. Nowhere does *Devine* suggest that *Devine* modifies any of its processing engines during a determining step without interrupting the determination of the solution by the modification. This is simply not discussed nor suggested in *Devine*.

*Kendall* also fails to disclose or suggest modifying any of its processing engines during a determining step without interrupting the determination of the solution by the modification. Therefore, *Devine* in view of *Kendall* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 5, 9, and 10.

Claims 3 and 7 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 or 5 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 5 are allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, and 10 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


_____ (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch
SONNENSCHEIN, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Telephone 312/876-2606
Customer #58328
Attorneys for Applicant(s)